

Titusville Morning Herald.

CROSERIES, &c.

GREAT
TORPEDOES!
Blood Purifier!**REGNAULT'S**
WORLD-RENNED
EUREKA BITTERS!WILL PURIFY THE BLOOD!
WILL GIVE YOU A GOOD APPETITE!
WILL CURE NERVOUS DEBILITY!
WILL CURE LIVER COMPLAINTS!
WILL CURE ACIDITY OF THE STOMACH!
WILL CURE ALL DISEASES OF THE KIDNEYS.WILL CURE BILLIOUS DISEASES!
WILL CURE CHRONIC DIARRHEA!
WILL CURE FEVER AND AGUE!
WILL CURE INDIGESTION!
WILL CURE HEADACHE!

And will Prevent

These diseases and all Nervous Affectations, by helping the body in perfect health, will entirely extirpate the disease, relieve pain, and is invaluable to persons of sedentary habits. These Bitters are a

DELIGHTFUL

Stomach Corrector

Give a keen relish for food, go directly to the seat of the disease, give immediate relief and permanent benefit. Ladies troubled with weakness of any kind, will and immediate benefit in using these Bitters, and no family should be without them. In fact they are

A Family Medicine!

Unequalled

By any other Bitters.

GRANGER & CO.,
Titusville, Pa.,

Sole Agents for the United States.

NEW TEAS!
NEW TEAS!

IMMENSE SALE OF TEAS!

AT THE

Great Western

TEA AGENCY!
GRANGER & CO.,

Agents

SOLE AGENTS.

CLARK, HAYES & CO.,

WHOLESALE

GROCERS

AND

Liquor Dealers.

15 & 17 DIAMOND ST.

10 & 12, Pine St.

TITUSVILLE, PA.

F. A. Roter,

No. 5 Spring Street,

OPPOSITE CORINTHIAN HALL,

Titusville, Pa.

DEALER IN ALL KINDS OF FANCY

FOREIGN & DOMESTIC NUTS & FRUIT

Also French & Home Confectioneries

of every description.

FINE FAMILY CROCERIES,

New, Fresh and Clean. Mouth-watering Jellies,

Reserves, and Canned Fruits of richest brands.

Also Turnips.

OYSTERS & SARDINES

By the gross can. FRESH VEGETABLES

of all kinds. FRESH EGGS

Food delivered in any part of the city or

vicinity.

176-181

Plumbing and Gas Fitting

The largest and cheapest stock of

GAS FIXTURES

And Plumbers' Materials in

the City.

The subscriber has the services of

practical men, both in the Plumbing and Gas

Fitting business, is now prepared to fit up

Houses and Stores with Hot and

Cold Water Pipes or Gas Pipes

At reasonable rates. All work from this shop

warranted. All orders sent at the same of the

COMPANY, on

the same principles.

JOHN O'NEILL.

BUILDINGS MOVED.

We are ready to move buildings, having a full

complement of all the tackle and machinery nec-

essary and from our great experience in the busi-

ness, we can do it at the lowest cost.

GIVE US A CALL.

MEAGHER & CO.

Agents for Franklin & Ward Brothers

181, Jameson, N.Y.

181, Jameson, N.Y.

TO OIL OPERATORS.

THE ROBERTS'
PETROLEUM**TORPEDO COMPANY**WILL PURIFY THE BLOOD!
WILL GIVE YOU A GOOD APPETITE!

WILL CURE NERVOUS DEBILITY!

WILL CURE LIVER COMPLAINTS!

WILL CURE ACIDITY OF THE STOMACH!

WILL CURE ALL DISEASES OF THE KIDNEYS.

WILL CURE BILLIOUS DISEASES!

WILL CURE CHRONIC DIARRHEA!

WILL CURE FEVER AND AGUE!

WILL CURE INDIGESTION!

WILL CURE HEADACHE!

And will Prevent

These diseases and all Nervous Affectations, by helping the body in perfect health, will entirely extirpate the disease, relieve pain, and is invaluable to persons of sedentary habits. These Bitters are a

DELIGHTFUL

Stomach Corrector

Give a keen relish for food, go directly to the seat of the disease, give immediate relief and permanent benefit. Ladies troubled with weakness of any kind, will and immediate benefit in using these Bitters, and no family should be without them. In fact they are

A Family Medicine!

so that every Operator can afford

to try a Torpedo before abandon-

ing a Well.

The following is the decision rendered by Judge Grier on the twenty-second day of September, 1863, in the United States Circuit Court at Philadelphia. The case was argued three days by Charles M. Koller of New York, B. F. Lucas and S. A. Purvis of Pittsburgh, for defendants, and George H. Christie of Philadelphia, and George C. Reed, a patentee, for plaintiff:

OPINION OF JUDGE GRIER.

As I write with difficulty I can only state the conclusion to which mind has come after a careful examination of the case.

The complainant exhibited a patent dated 25th April, 1863. This is prima facie evidence of the originality of the invention, but the burden of proof that the patent is valid or worthless

rests on the infringer of the patent, admitted, as a fact, that the decision which applies clearly to the present case.

The infringement of the patent is admitted, as also is the originality of the invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

It was after speculation had been reduced to a minimum, and the complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, that the complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.

The complainant succeeded in establishing the originality of his invention, and the validity of complainant's patent of April 25, 1863.